



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,530	12/17/2003	Kenji Aiyama	03500.017821.	4325
5514 7590 08/16/2007 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/736,530	Applicant(s) AIYAMA, KENJI	
	Examiner Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/16/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13, 18-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al (Pub. No.: US 20020145750 in view of Moats (Pub. No.: US 20030151762)

Regarding claim 1, 6, 11-12, 18 and 24 Honda et al disclose: An image processing apparatus (note Fig. 1 and 2) which receives a print job according to a predetermined print service request from a data processing apparatus and processes said received print job (note Figs. 2 and 3) comprising: storing means for storing group information set every said predetermined print service request (note Figs. 2&3, page 4, paragraph 0086-0092 and page 5, paragraphs 0100-0103, where the group information is registered in the memory section 49 of Fig. 3) discriminating means for discriminating whether a print job according to a specific print service request which is received corresponds to the group information stored in said storing means or not (note page 4, paragraph 0086-0090, where the discrimination means which is the setting of passwords or passcodes would discriminate between the privileges of different client and group for the print jobs, also note Figs. 10&11, paragraph 0176, also note page 7) and job control means for controlling permission/inhibition of the execution of the print job according to the predetermined print service request or the specific print service request on the basis of said group information or said specific group information (note paragraph 0120, where in the permission or inhibitions are

Art Unit: 2625

determined based on the privileges given to different groups or in this case companies and some cases individuals to be able to print the job) Honda et al do not clearly disclose: setting means for, if it is determined by said discriminating means that said print job does not correspond, setting specific group information for enabling the print job to be executed into said non-corresponding print job. On the other hand Moats disclose: setting means for, if it is determined by said discriminating means that said print job does not correspond, setting specific group information for enabling the print job to be executed into said non-corresponding print job (note Figs. 2A-2C, where it is determined whether the job is private or non-private, if private the job would be asked of authorization to be printed and if not the job is set up to be printed as disclosed on Fig.2B).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Honda et al's invention according to the teaching of Moats, Where Moats in the same field of endeavor teaches the way the non-private job would be distinguished, and printed on the printing system, This would modify the Honda's invention and optimizes the system capabilities.

Regarding claim 2 Honda et al disclose: An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said specific print service request is an Internet print service (note Fig.1, where the print service is requested through the internet, page 4, paragraph 0082).

Regarding claim 3 Moats discloses: An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said setting means sets the specific group information for enabling the print job to be executed and a passcode into said non-corresponding print job (note Fig.2A-2C, where the authorization is given for non-private jobs).

Regarding claim 4 Honda et al disclose: An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said job control means controls the permission/inhibition of the execution of the print job according to the predetermined print service request or the specific print service request on the basis of a job management table (note page 7, paragraph 0120).

Regarding claim 5 Honda et al disclose: An apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said discriminating means discriminates whether the print job according to the specific print service request corresponds to the group information stored in said storing means or not in accordance with a port connected by said print service (note Fig.5, page 7, paragraph 0120, where the security management section 147 of Fig.5 and the table 148 discriminate to determine the access to the print job).

Regarding claim 7 Honda et al disclose: A method according to claim 6, wherein said specific print service request is an Internet print service (note Fig.1, where the print service is requested through the internet, page 4, paragraph 0082).

Regarding claim 8 Moats discloses: A method according to claim 6, wherein in said setting step, the specific group information for enabling the print job to be executed and a passcode are set into said non-corresponding print job (note Fig.2A-2C, where the authorization is given for non-private jobs).

Regarding claim 9 Honda et al disclose: A method according to claim 6, wherein in said job control step, the permission/inhibition of the execution of the print job according to the predetermined print service request or the specific print service request is controlled on the basis of a job management table (note page 7, paragraph 0120).

Regarding claim 10 Honda et al disclose: A method according to claim 6, wherein in said

Art Unit: 2625

discriminating step, whether the print job according to the specific print service request corresponds to the group information stored in said storing means or not is discriminated in accordance with a port connected by said print service (note Fig.5, page 7, paragraph 0120, where the security management section 147 of Fig.5 and the table 148 discriminate to determine the access to the print job).

Regarding claim 13 Honda et al disclose: An apparatus according to claim 12, wherein the user or the group which has previously been designated for said print service can be changed (note page 7, paragraph 0120, where the privileges table 148 of Fig.5 could be altered and based on the groups or companies who use the print services).

Regarding claim 19 Honda et al disclose: An apparatus according to claim 18, wherein the standard values of said group identification information and said passcode information of said every print service can be changed (note page 7, paragraph 0120, where the privileges table 148 of Fig.5 could be altered and based on the groups or companies who use the print services).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al (Pub. No.: US 20020145750) in view of Moats (Pub. No.: US 20040088378) and further in view of Cherry et al (Pub. No.: US 20030151762)

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 14 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 12, wherein said image processing apparatus can set a mode for refusing printing of a specific user or group (note Figs.3&4 page 3, paragraph 0035, where the access to the user with special privileges would be denied).

Regarding claim 15 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 12, wherein said image processing apparatus can set a mode for refusing printing of a specific user or group in accordance with conditions of the print data (note Figs.3&4, page 3, paragraph 0035, where the printing to the printer is not permitted if there is not matching of sophistication of the authorization code).

Regarding claim 16 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 12, wherein said image processing apparatus can make management of the number of print copies on a user or group unit basis (note Fig.4, items 408 and 410, where the determination is made based on the copying of different pages and page limitation, page 3, paragraph 0035).

Regarding claim 17 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 12, wherein said image processing apparatus can make management of the number of print copies on a user or group unit basis in accordance with conditions of the print data (note Fig.4, items 408 and 410, where the determination is made based on the copying of different pages and page limitation, page 3, paragraph 0035).

Regarding claim 20 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 18, wherein said image processing apparatus can set a mode for refusing printing of a specific group (note Figs.3&4 page 3, paragraph 0035, where the access to the user with special privileges would be denied).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 21 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 18, wherein said image processing apparatus can refuse printing of a specific group in accordance with conditions of the print data (note Figs.3&4, page 3, paragraph 0032, where each print job has a header with authorization added to it to determine whether the specific user could use the print services).

Regarding claim 22 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 18, wherein said image processing apparatus can make management of the number of print copies on a group unit basis (note Fig.4, items 408 and 410, where the determination is made based on the copying of different pages and page limitation, page 3, paragraph 0035).

Regarding claim 23 Cherry et al discloses: An apparatus according to claim 18, wherein said image processing apparatus can make management of the number of print copies on a group unit basis in accordance with conditions of the print data (note Fig.4, items 408 and 410, where the determination is made based on the copying of different pages and page limitation, page 3, paragraph 0035).

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy whose telephone number is 703-306-3487. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri,8:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Saeid Ebrahimi
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2625
August 7, 2007

